

REMARKS

Claims 1, 8, and 43 have been amended to more distinctly claim and particularly point out subject matter considered as the invention. No new matter has been added.

Phone Interview

On June 17th, 2003 and June 24, 2003, phone interviews were conducted between Examiner Nguyen and Marc S. Hanish, Reg. No. 42,626. During these interviews, a draft copy of this response was discussed. Applicant contended that the final rejection was improper because even with the assumptions that were made in the final office action regarding IWFs and NAses, that the cited art still did not teach the invention as claimed. It was discovered that the confusion may have been in the second element of claim 1 and related claims, namely the broadcasting of the information regarding a change to the central database to each POP. Examiner had believed that the broadcast could have come from a user to the NAS. Applicant contended that such a broadcast would not be able to contain information regarding a change to a central database.

In order to more quickly come to an agreement, applicant offered to add the language "from said central database" to "broadcasting a message". However, applicant still maintains that the claims as originally drafted are not anticipated by the prior art because a user cannot know each time a central database is changed.

Additionally, applicant still maintains that the cited prior art does not teach or suggest the maintaining of a central database of all NAses known to the computer network, but rather only teaches a database of all NAses known to the PoP.

Therefore, while applicant has agreed to amend claims 1, 8, and 43 to make the claims more clear, applicant maintains that such a change is not one that would necessitate a new search or ground of rejection. Should the examiner wish to conduct a new prior art search, applicant respectfully maintains that any new rejection based on that prior art should part of a non-final office action, as opposed to a final office action.

The 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 25, 27-29, 40, 43, 44, 48 and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Chuah et al.¹ This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the "Response to Arguments" section, the office action alleges that "Chuah discloses The POPs and the ISP's data center 14 are connected together over the intranet backbone through router 12A (col. 1, lines 19-54, col. 9, lines 10-48; plural interworking function modules (IWFs) which are considered as network access servers (NASes) in the network; and col. 33, lines 45-53."

The Applicant does not understand how the described parts and citations disclose a central database of all NASes known to the computer network. Applicant respectfully requests clarification of this point.

¹ U.S. Patent No. 6,400,722

Assuming that plural interworking function modules (IWFs) are identical to NASes (which applicant is not admitting), it is still unclear how that would teach a central database of all NASes known to the computer network. Chuah does not disclose the teaching of a central database of all IWFs either. Chuah only discloses a database of all NASes that have attempted to communicate with the home gateway, which often would not include a number of foreign NASes known to the network. To the extent that IWFs are identical to NASes, then Chuah would merely show a database of all IWF controlled locally along with foreign IWFs that have attempted to communicate with the home gateway. Thus, Chuah would still be unable to track foreign IWFs that for whatever reason have not attempted to communicate with the home gateway.

Furthermore, the "Response to Arguments" section of the Office Action further alleges that "Chuah discloses from the point of view of the intranet or ISP's PPP server, the IWF (interworking function) looks like a network access server (NAS) (col. 9, lines 36-48). Chuah also discloses an IWF is implemented in the base station (POP) to relay traffic between the end user and a communications server such as a PPP server, and the base station includes an access hub and at least one access point, and the access hub includes a proxy registration agent that end system is able to communication with the proxy registration agent (col. 8, line 12 - col. 9, line 48, col. 11, lines 12-20, and col. 42, line 52 - col. 44, line 37)."

Once again, applicant is unclear as to how to teaches the claimed invention. Specifically, applicant is unclear how these parts or citations disclose the broadcasting of a message to a NAS list located at each POP. No matter which parts are relaying traffic, Chuah still merely discloses sending a message to a proxy registration agent, which is only located at a data center, not at each

POP. It is unclear how the fact that an IWF is implemented in the base station to relay traffic changes this. There is no disclosure of the IWF maintaining a NAS list.

The First 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 3-5, 26 and 45-47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Chuah et al. in view of Holt et al.². This rejection is respectfully traversed for the same reasons as listed above.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims

The argument set forth above is equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Request for Allowance

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

² U.S. Patent No. 6,070,192

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Request for Entry of Amendment

Entry of this Amendment will place the Application in better condition for allowance, or at the least, narrow any issues for an appeal. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment is appropriate and is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THELEN REID & PRIEST LLP

Dated: 6/27/03



Marc S. Hanish
Reg. No. 42,626

THELEN REID & PRIEST LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
(408) 292-5800